

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 11 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bryson et al. (US 3,733,947).

### **INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicant's representative William Gehris (Reg. No. 38,156) conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Prone regarding claim 1 language "the period of time being at least as long..." and Examiner Prone agreed that this language may not have been considered and will review the patent application again. No agreement was reached.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

### **35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejections**

Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 11 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bryson et al. (US 3,733,947).

Office Action of September 27, 2004 asserts that the Bryson discloses a pusher element that moves at the same speed as the table for a "period of time", that period of time being an "instantaneous point in time". Claim 1 of the present invention discloses

"a driver configured to move the pusher element at a same speed as the front table for a period of time with the pusher element in engagement with a first edge portion of the sheet material article and the backstop in engagement with a second edge portion of the sheet material article, **the period of time being at least as long as a time required for a front clamp of the sheet material article trimmer to move through a distance corresponding to a difference in thickness between a thinnest sheet material article in a range of thicknesses and a thickest sheet material article in the range of thicknesses so as to grip the sheet material article against the front table.**"

Applicants respectfully submit that the relevant part of claim 1 of the present invention provides a definition of the "period of time" in its limitations and that this period of time is longer

Appl. No. 10/001,769  
Amdt. dated January 27, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 27, 2004

than an “instantaneous point in time”.


Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1 to 5, 7 to 11 and 21 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/001,769  
Amdt. dated January 27, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 27, 2004

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,  
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:   
William C. Gehris  
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940